

University of South Carolina Scholar Commons

Faculty Publications

English Language and Literatures, Department of

7-1999

Die altenglischen Glossen zu Aldhelms "De laudibus virginitatis" in der Handschrift BL, Royal 6 B. VII.

Scott Gwara

University of South Carolina - Columbia, gwaras@mailbox.sc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/engl_facpub



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Publication Info

Published in *Speculum*, Volume 74, Issue 3, 1999, pages 820-822.

Gwara, Scott. (1999). Die altenglischen Glossen zu Aldhelms "De laudibus virginitatis" in der Handschrift BL, Royal 6 B. VII.

Speculum, 74 (3), 820-822.

©Speculum 1999, Cambridge University Press

This Book Review is brought to you by the English Language and Literatures, Department of at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.

torians who employed court roll evidence are also cited as having been unacknowledged by scholars, yet the editors themselves repeatedly emphasize that the former had virtually no impact upon the subsequent direction of scholarship (see, for example, pp. 1, 9, 11, 12). This, of course, is the critical point; generally speaking, before the 1960s and 1970s, scholars arguing that the lives of peasant farmers were essential to understanding the grand scheme of history were overshadowed by a century and more of mainstream scholarship that held the opposite position.

The historiographical moment for studying peasants, which is what the analysis of court rolls essentially encourages, has never been so promising as it is at present. The frontiers in medieval agrarian and village scholarship in the 1990s, which are heavily social and cultural, attribute to these communities a vital history that reconfigures and outstrips older ideas about the powers of lordship (Rosamond Faith's 1997 book, *The English Peasantry and the Growth of Lordship*, reappraises precisely these questions for the earlier medieval period). In contrast, the backward-looking perspective of the volume here under review is fully apparent in the editors' assertion that their book demonstrates signs of "moving full circle" back to Maitland and others and in their hopes of sustaining "the current momentum so that the circle is finally closed" (p. 35). The predilections of nineteenth-century historiography espoused here are not progressive and, at the end of the twentieth century, are unnecessarily divisive.

SHERRI OLSON, University of Connecticut

MARTIN RICHTER, *Die altenglischen Glossen zu Aldhelms "De laudibus virginittis" in der Handschrift BL, Royal 6 B. VII.* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie, 19.) Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1996. Paper. Pp. xcii, 175; tables and diagrams. DM 68.

Some time in the 670s the Anglo-Saxon Aldhelm of Malmesbury (d. 709) composed a treatise on virginity in dense Latin prose that was widely admired and studied. Readers annotated the so-called *Liber de virginitate* as early as the eighth century, and about sixty thousand glosses to the text survive in a dozen manuscripts spanning the ninth through the twelfth centuries. Martin Richter has edited the Old English glosses from a late-eleventh-century book copied at Exeter: London, British Library, MS Royal 6 B.vii. In many respects his work usefully augments material first published in Arthur Napier's famous compendium, *Old English Glosses, Chiefly Unpublished* (Oxford, 1900; repr. Hildesheim, 1969).

Richter's edition supplies folio and line references to the Royal manuscript, followed by Latin lemmas, Old English glosses (and Latin, if in context with Old English), contextual citations from Rudolf Ehwald's 1919 edition, and selections from Michael Lapidge's 1979 English translation of the treatise. Apparatuses at the foot of the page offer comparable glosses in other sources, philological commentary, and details about the manuscript reading when appropriate. On the whole, the transcription is highly accurate and comes with a superabundance of useful commentary. The introduction treats a variety of topics, including Aldhelm's life and work, the manuscripts containing Old English Aldhelm glosses, the date and construction of Royal 6 B.vii, the glossing typology, and aspects of the phonology. The tables are beautifully produced, and the German prose quite accessible.

The encyclopedic erudition of this book does not, however, prevent me from objecting to some of Richter's conclusions. Let me say from the outset that I have intensively studied Royal 6 B.vii and draw some of my observations from an article in *Anglo-Saxon England* 27 (1998) and from an edition of Aldhelm's prose treatise now in preparation.

With the exception of section 5, Richter's work could fairly be described as assembled rather than written. The material on Aldhelm's life and work and on the structure and contents of the treatise is drawn almost entirely from Michael Lapidge's findings, as ac-

knowledge. Other large portions rest on the conclusions of Arthur Napier, Louis Goossens, and Gernot Wieland. More alarming than these arguably necessary summaries are some misconceptions and corrigenda. Section 3, which enumerates glossed manuscripts of the treatise, does not supply correct shelfmarks in three cases: Phillipps Collection 8071 = New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, MS 401; Phillipps Collection 20688 = New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, MS 401A; and Merton Collection 41 = Oslo, Collection of Martin Schøyen, MS 197. Old English glosses likewise crop up in a newly discovered *membrum disiectum* of this dismembered manuscript: London, British Library, MS Add. 71687. At the risk of appearing self-serving, I note that detailed remarks I made on dates and provenances for many of these manuscripts have been ignored (*Studi medievali*, 1994).

Some misinformation about Royal 6 B.vii could stand correction. Although Richter cites Elaine Drage's 1978 Oxford D.Phil. thesis that "the nucleus of the manuscript was probably written at Exeter towards the *end* of the eleventh century" (my emphasis), he gives the date as "s. xi²." In fact, Drage concludes that the book was not written in Bishop Leofric's time but afterwards, when Anglo-Norman influences had penetrated the scriptorium (*post* 1072). In my view Royal 6 B.vii was likely produced in conjunction with Aldhelm's re-sanctification and the translation of his relics under Bishop Osmund of Salisbury, ca. 1078. This notable event also occasioned the composition of a *Vita Aldelmi* by the Italian cellarer of Malmesbury, Faricius of Arezzo.

The date I propose complicates the argument on dissemination in section 6 of Richter's book. Richter accepts Louis Goossens's hypothesis that glosses in Royal 6 B.vii were copied from Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS 1650 (text: s. XI^m; glosses: s. XI^m–XI^l) before the glossing in Brussels had been completed. Even disregarding the paleographical implausibility, conjunctive errors in the Latin glosses prove that the Royal (and Brussels) compendia stem from the corpus in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 146, a Canterbury book dating from the late tenth century:

<i>Lemma</i>	<i>Gloss in Royal and Digby</i>	<i>Gloss in Brussels</i>
QVAESTVVM	lucrarum	lucrorum
MARTIRIZARETVR	cruaretur	cruciaretur
VICTORIA	tropheti	trophea

Similar conjunctive errors occur in all three manuscripts: PANDO] curuu (*for* curuo). Furthermore, misplaced words in Digby 146 frequently engendered other erroneous glosses. An intrusive quotation from Isidore's *Etymologiae* caused a copyist to place the phrase "i. semina frugum" above the lemma "FERRO FORTIOR" in an apograph, whence it was transmitted to the Royal and Brussels manuscripts. Glosses in Royal that are not found in Digby must therefore have been copied into an intermediary. Finally, the claim that scholia written in three hands (as in Brussels 1650) must have given rise to identical scholia in one hand (as in Royal) oversimplifies complexities of the transmission, which I have recently discussed (*Studi medievali*, 1997). Neither Goossens nor Richter observed such incongruities because they took no notice of the seventy-two hundred Latin glosses transmitted side-by-side with the Old English ones. Richter's omission, a result of his emphasis on Old English philology, devalues his comprehensive tabulations of corresponding Old English glosses in other Aldhelm manuscripts.

For Royal 6 B.vii the gloss transmission is enigmatically unrelated to the textual transmission, about which Richter might have said more. Collation reveals that the text must derive directly from London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 200, *pars* i (s. X²), a manuscript with only eighty-nine Latin glosses and 1 Old English gloss. Lambeth and Royal share unique conjunctive errors. In the following collation I provide the lemma from my forthcoming Corpus Christianorum edition alongside unique readings sampled from Royal (R) and Lambeth (L): iteret] iter curruque corusco et R L; pendere] reddere R L; ardore] amore

R L; baptisterio] baptismo R L; fidei *om.* R L; ratiocinationis] rationis R L; carnalis] carnis R L; lucia saluo pudoris signaculo] lucia uirgo saluo pudoris R L. Dozens of similar variants prove irrefutably that the Lambeth text engendered that in Royal 6 B.vii.

Richter plainly has the expertise to make the foregoing deductions, which, in turn, might have led him to investigate the origins of Exeter manuscripts, to disambiguate aspects of the textual history, and perhaps to find reasons for innumerable Latin absurdities in an ostensibly deluxe volume. By any reckoning, then, investigations of the date and textual transmission should not be set aside in the study of a single manuscript. For the record: vernacular glosses are frequently transmitted with Latin ones in multiple manuscripts, and tackling the transmission of such scholia means exploring the entire corpus, no matter the size. I am not simply impeaching the fifty-meter champion for failing to run the marathon. The decision to record only vernacular glosses and to ignore thousands of Latin ones has compromised this otherwise learned volume on many levels.

SCOTT GWARA, University of South Carolina

DAVID ROSAND, *Painting in Sixteenth-Century Venice: Titian, Veronese, Tintoretto*. Rev. ed. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Pp. xix, 279 plus 32 color plates; 157 black-and-white figures. \$85 (cloth); \$24.95 (paper). Revised edition of *Painting in Cinquecento Venice* published by Yale University Press in 1982.

It is a tribute to the lasting value of David Rosand's work that Cambridge University Press has published a revised edition of his *Painting in Cinquecento Venice* that is little changed from the original. With updates to the bibliography and endnotes, additional color plates, and an addendum to the preface, this book continues to be an important model and resource for students, teachers, and scholars of Venetian Renaissance art.

In the seventeen years since the original edition of this book, significant contributions have been made to the study of Venetian Renaissance art, architecture, and history. Much of this work is concerned with cultural contexts, both immediate and expansive, for artworks, artifacts, buildings, performances, writings, events, and lives in the Venetian republic. In the midst of this richly informative scholarship, the revised edition of Rosand's book reminds us that paintings have the power to reach beyond their cultural contexts. For Rosand, these paintings communicate by means of pictorial strategies that initiate an ongoing tradition of viewer response and interpretation. The importance Rosand places on looking closely at these paintings is underscored by the dedication of this revised edition to one of his mentors, Howard McParlin Davis, "a great teacher who taught so many to see." If in the revisions to the preface Rosand suggests a potentially hostile relationship between historical-contextual studies and visual analysis, his main text skillfully combines them, demonstrating that these two methodologies can enhance each other. Rosand's visual analyses identify the pictorial devices and formal strategies of particular Venetian paintings, while his emphasis on the artists as the inventive manipulators of these elements firmly grounds the creative process in a historical and cultural context.

Rosand's first chapter outlines a general context for the closer consideration of artists and paintings taken up in the following four chapters. It not only provides geographical, political, and historical information but also describes the social situation of the artist, essential characteristics of painting technique and materials, observations on the treatment of space and narrative in Venetian painting, and an ample account of the *disegno/colorito* controversy. Already in chapter 1, the author calls attention to what is unique about the styles and abilities of individual Venetian painters, such as Giovanni Bellini and Giorgione. Chapter 2 reads like a selective, yet richly integrated, monograph, providing historical context, a chronology of change in Titian's painting with a focused reading of several